

REMARKS

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5, 7-8, 12-18, 20-23, 25, 27-29, 31, 34-36, 39 and 42-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Dessiatnikov, Dmitry “Securing SZL Connection String”(GIAC Security Essentials Certification Practical Assignment – version 1.4b Option 1 SANS Institute January 8, 2004) (*Dessiatnikov*). Claims 14-16 have been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot. Applicant submits claims 1, 5, 7-8, 12-13, 17-18, 20, 23, 25, 27-29, 31, 34-36, 39 and 42-43 are not anticipated *Dessiatnikov* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 14 and 15 and recites, in part, the following:

automatically requesting database connection information from a web application server to a database upon initialization of the web application server;

Independent claims 18, 31, 36 and 39 recite similar limitations. The Office action cites *Dessiatnikov* as disclosing the limitations of claim 1 (and also the limitations of claims 14 and 15). Specifically, the Office action states that *Dessiatnikov* discloses “automatically requesting a connection to a database and initialization of server.” Perhaps there was a typo in the Office action, but Applicant has not claimed automatically requesting a connection to a database and automatically requesting initialization of a server. Rather, Applicant claims automatically requesting database connection information to a database upon initialization of a web application server. For at least this reason, the rejection is erroneous.

However, even if the above statement in the Office action includes an accidental typo, *Dessiatnikov* still fails to disclose the claimed limitations of claim 1. Cited portions of *Dessiatnikov* (i.e., Introduction Par. 1 and SQL Authentication vs. Windows Authentication Par. 1) are devoid of any discussion of web application server initialization. Given that *Dessiatnikov* fails to disclose web application server initialization, *Dessiatnikov* necessarily fails to disclose automatically requesting database connection information from a web application server to a database upon initialization of the web application server. Accordingly, Applicant submits claims 1, 18, 31, 36 and 39 are not anticipated by *Dessiatnikov*.

Claims 5, 7-8, 12-13 and 17 depend from claim 1. Claims 20-23, 25 and 27-29 depend from claim 18. Claims 34-35 depend from claim 31. Claims 42-43 depend from claim 39. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits claims 5, 7-8, 12-13, 17, 20-23, 25, 27, 29, 34-35 and 42-43 are not anticipated by *Dessiatnikov* for at least the same reasons claims 1, 18, 31, 36 and 39 are not anticipated.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being obvious in view of *Dessiatnikov* and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No.: 2003/0105977 to Brabson et al. (*Brabson*). Claim 30 depends from claim 18 and necessarily includes the limitations of the independent claim. Similar to the discussion above, *Dessiatnikov* fails a web application server to access a key phrase responsive to an automatic request to connect with a database upon initialization of the web application server. *Brabson* is cited as disclosing a directory that transitions from storing unencrypted to storing

encrypted data. Whether or not *Brabson* discloses the limitations cited in the Office action, which Applicant does not concede, *Brabson* does not cure the deficiencies of *Dessiatnikov*. Accordingly, Applicant submits claim 30 is not obvious in view of *Dessiatnikov* and *Brabson*.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1, 5, 7-8, 12-18, 20-23, 25, 27-29, 31, 34-36, 39 and 42-43 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: June 18, 2008

/Jared S. Engstrom/
Jared S. Engstrom
Reg. No. 58,330
Attorney for Applicant

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: June 18, 2008

/Katherine Jennings/
Katherine Jennings